

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-12, as amended, remain herein. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 4, and claim 4 has been cancelled.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview with applicants' representative on June 5, 2008. During the interview, the Examiner agreed that Thompson U.S. Patent 5,406,627 fails to disclose a decoder and video display within a single case, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

The Examiner further agreed that Thompson fails to disclose a condenser means and charging means, as recited in applicants' previous claim 4. Thompson discloses a battery 403 that is disconnected from the circuit when the case is opened. The Office Action cited battery 403 as both a condenser and a charging means. If the battery 403 is a condenser (a device that receives and stores a charge), it cannot be the charging means. Thompson discloses no device for charging the battery.

The Examiner further agreed that Thompson further fails to disclose a discharging means for discharging a condenser when the case is opened, as recited in applicants' previous claim 4. In fact, Thompson performs an opposite operation to that disclosed in previous claim 4. In Thompson, switch 404 cuts off power from battery 403 to PLD 411 when the case is opened. The battery 403 is not discharged when the case is opened.

1. Fig. 10 has been amended, mooting the objection thereto.

2. Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Thompson. As discussed above, the Examiner agreed that Thompson fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, including a decoder and video display within a single case, a condenser means, charging means, and discharging means. Since Thompson fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, Thompson is an inadequate basis for rejecting claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

3. Claims 2, 5-7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Thompson and Parikh U.S. Patent 5,243,651. Thompson discloses a system for distributing video signals to theatres. The signals are encrypted upon transmission and decrypted upon receipt. Also, when a transmitting or receiving case is opened, the opening is detected, and power is cut off from the volatile digital memory that stores the encryption codes, thereby erasing the codes.

Regarding claim 2, as discussed above, Thompson fails to disclose a decoder and video display within a single case, as recited in applicants' claim 2. Parikh fails to provide what Thompson lacks. Parikh discloses a module for insertion into a cable box so that when a service person accesses the cable box, the customers continue receiving service. Parikh fails to disclose a decoder and video display within a single case.

Regarding claims 5-7 and 12, the Examiner has admitted that Thompson fails to disclose a condenser means, charging means, and discharging means, as recited in claims 5 and 12. Parikh fails to disclose what Thompson lacks. Parikh discloses a card that communicates with a microprocessor in a cable service box to allow a serviceperson to manipulate the digital signal circuitry. Parikh fails to disclose a condenser means, charging means, and discharging means.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify either Thompson or Parikh to render applicants' claims obvious. As discussed above, Thompson fails to disclose the condenser means of applicants' claims 5 and 12, or any charging means. And the operation of Thompson is the opposite of that in applicants' claims 5 and 12.

Since neither Thompson nor Parikh discloses every element of applicants' claims 5 and 12; and since it would not have been obvious to modify either Thompson or Parikh to render applicants' claims 2, 5 and 12 obvious; Thompson and Parikh are inadequate grounds for rejecting claims 2, 5-7 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

4. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Thompson and Atobe U.S. Patent 5,051,601. For the reasons stated above, Thompson fails to disclose every element of applicants' claim 1, including a condenser means, a charging means, and a discharging means. Atobe fails to provide what Thompson lacks. Atobe discloses a laser printer with light-emitting and receiving elements. Atobe fails to disclose a condenser means, a charging means, and a discharging means, as recited in applicants' claim 1, from which claim 3 depends. Nor would it have been obvious to modify Atobe to render applicants' claim 3 obvious. Atobe contains no disclosure that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a condenser means, charging means, and discharging means, as recited in applicants' claim 1. Thus, Thompson and Atobe are inadequate grounds for rejecting claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

5. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Thompson and Nardone U.S. Patent 6,175,925. For the reasons stated above, Thompson fails to disclose a condenser means, a

charging means, and a discharging means, as recited in applicants' claim 8. Nardone fails to provide what Thompson lacks. Nardone discloses comparing a signature of a module with a pre-stored signature for the module to determine whether the module has been tampered with. Nardone fails to disclose a condenser means, a charging means, and a discharging means, as recited in applicants' claim 8.

Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify either Thompson or Nardone to render obvious applicants' claim 8. Neither Thompson nor Nardone provides any disclosure that would have motivated one of ordinary skill in the art to use a condenser means, a charging means, and a discharging means as recited in applicants' claim 8. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

6. Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Thompson, Nardone, and Parikh. For the reasons stated above, none of Thompson, Nardone, and Parikh discloses a condenser means, a charging means, and a discharging means, as recited in applicants' claim 8, from which claims 9 and 10 depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

7. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Thompson, Parikh, and Atobe. As discussed above, none of Thompson, Parikh, and Atobe discloses a video display and a decoder within the same case, as recited in applicants' claim 2, from which claim 11 depends. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify any of Thompson, Parikh, and Atobe to render applicants' claim 11 obvious. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, claims 1-3 and 5-12 are now fully in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge or credit any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 19-4293. Should the Examiner deem that any further amendments would be desirable in placing this application in even better condition for issue, he is invited to telephone applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP




Roger W. Parkhurst  
Reg. No. 25,177  
Adam C. Ellsworth  
Reg. No. 55,152

Date: June 9, 2008

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP  
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-1795  
Tel: (202) 429-3000  
Fax: (202) 429-3902


Attorney Docket No.: 28951.1183

Fig.10



PRIOR ART

Fig.10



PRIOR ART